UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,953	04/19/2005	Takashi Hosoda	Q87576	4306

23373 7590 02/24/2010

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER	
BIRBACH, NAOMI L	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1792	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/24/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

sughrue@sughrue.com
PPROCESSING@SUGHRUE.COM
USPTO@SUGHRUE.COM

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/531,953	HOSODA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	NAOMI BIRBACH	1792	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 February 2010*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *6-15* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-5* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *04192005*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/02/10 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

2. Claims 1-15 are pending. Claims 6-15 have been withdrawn from consideration. Applicant's amendments filed 2/02/2010 are acknowledged.

Specification

3. Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or use thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative.

The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.

Where applicable, the abstract should include the following:
(1) if a machine or apparatus, its organization and operation;

(2) if an article, its method of making;
(3) if a chemical compound, its identity and use;
(4) if a mixture, its ingredients;
(5) if a process, the steps.

Extensive mechanical and design details of apparatus should not be given.

4. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

5. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is more than a single paragraph and because it refers to purported merits of the invention. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

8. Claim 1 recites the limitation "wherein, after the washing step, the self-washing is conducted within the time for conveying the lens mold". This limitation renders the claim

indefinite because it is unclear when and for how long the lens mold is conveyed and to where the lens mold is conveyed. It appears that the instant disclosure indicates, but does not clearly describe the self-washing step. There is no prior mention of self-washing within the time for conveying the lens mold in claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

10. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2001-353650 to Tabata et al. (See machine translation) in view of JP S64-23224 to Murakami et al.

11. As to claim 1, Tabata discloses a scrubbing method to clean an optical component such as an optical lens form block (lens mold) (Page 2, Paragraph [0001]), where the lenses are made from plastic (Page 7, Paragraph [0026]). The method comprises a washing step of rotating the optical component while pressing an elastic polishing member against a surface of the optical component while rotating the polisher (Page 8, Paragraphs [0030]-[0032]). During this process, a liquid may be applied to wash the optical component, which is understood to be supplied to the area between the surface of the optical component and the elastic polishing member (Page 9, Paragraph [0035]; Figure 1). Tabata teaches that the liquid may be water (Page 9, Paragraph [0035]).

12. Tabata discloses that the pressure in the elastic polishing member may be adjusted to change the shape of the polisher, so it is understood to be deformable (Page 7, Paragraph [0024]). Tabata does not expressly disclose a self-washing step of rotating the elastic polishing

member in a position spaced from a position in which said washing step is conducted, and supplying the same liquid used in the washing step to the elastic polishing member and in this condition, deforming the elastic polishing member so as to thereby wash it, wherein after the washing step, the self-washing is conducted within the time for conveying the lens mold.

13. Murakami discloses a self-washing step of rotating a cleaning brush such as a sponge body (i.e. elastic polishing member), supplying a liquid to the cleaning member and in this condition, deforming the cleaning member by pressing and enlarging it, in order to wash the cleaning member (Pages 3, 5; Figure 2). Murakami teaches that the liquid used in the self-washing step may be water (Page 5), which is the same liquid used in the washing step. Murakami teaches that the self-cleaning step is performed at a place distant from a surface to be cleaned (Page 4), so it is reasonably expected that the self-washing step is performed in a position spaced from the position where the washing step is conducted. Murakami further discloses that the self-washing step may be performed simultaneously with a washing process (Page 6), meaning that they may also be performed separately or alternately. In addition, the selection of any order of performing process steps is prima facie obvious in the absence of new or unexpected results. *In re Burhans*, 154 F.2d 690, 69 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1946). While Murakami does not expressly teach that the self-washing is conducted within the time for conveying the lens mold, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to modify processing time through routine experimentation to optimize lens mold washing (MPEP 2144.05 II).

14. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method taught by Tabata to include a self-washing step as taught by Murakami for

the benefit of removing contamination that comes to adhere to the surface of a cleaning body during a cleaning process (Page 2). One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to add a self-washing step since a contaminated cleaning surface can reduce the cleaning effect and cause scratches on a surface to be cleaned (Page 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to perform the self-washing step in a spaced apart position to prevent the lens mold from being recontaminated by the self-washing step.

15. As to claims 2, Tabata further discloses that the liquid may be a slurry containing an abrasive dispersed in water (Page 9, Paragraph [0035]). While the combination of Tabata and Murakami does not expressly disclose using this liquid for the self-washing step, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a slurry containing an abrasive dispersed in water for the cleaning liquid in the self-cleaning step for the benefit of enhancing the self-washing process.

16. As to claim 3, Tabata further discloses that the liquid may be water (Page 9, Paragraph [0035]). Murakami teaches that the liquid used in the self-washing step may be water (Page 5).

17. As to claim 4, Tabata does not expressly disclose that deforming is conducted by pressing the elastic polishing member and a rod-like member against each other during self-washing.

18. Murakami further discloses that the self-washing is conducted while deforming the cleaning member by pressing the cleaning member and a rod-like member (paired press rolls, Ref. #6a, 6b or rod-like colliding body, Ref. #8) against each other (Pages 5-6, Figure 2).

19. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the method taught by Tabata and Murakami to include pressing a rod-like

member against the elastic polishing member as taught by Murakami in order to remove the dirt that is on the surface of the cleaning member (Page 5).

20. As to claim 5, Tabata does not expressly disclose that the self-washing step and washing step are conducted alternately.

21. Murakami further discloses that the self-washing step may be performed simultaneously with a washing process (Page 6), meaning that they may also be performed separately or alternately.

22. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the method taught by Tabata and Murakami to conduct the washing step and self-washing step alternately as taught by Murakami for the benefit of preventing further contamination.

23. Claims 1-3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2001-353650 to Tabata et al. (See machine translation) in view of EP 0764478 to Maekawa et al.

24. As to claims 1 and 5, Tabata discloses a scrubbing method to clean an optical component such as an optical lens form block (lens mold) (Page 2, Paragraph [0001]), where the lenses are made from plastic (Page 7, Paragraph [0026]). The method comprises a washing step of rotating the optical component while pressing an elastic polishing member against a surface of the optical component while rotating the polisher (Page 8, Paragraphs [0030]-[0032]). During this process, a liquid may be applied to wash the optical component, which is understood to be supplied to the area between the surface of the optical component and the elastic polishing member (Page 9,

Paragraph [0035]; Figure 1). Tabata teaches that the liquid may be water (Page 9, Paragraph [0035]).

25. Tabata discloses that the pressure in the elastic polishing member may be adjusted to change the shape of the polisher, so it is understood to be deformable (Page 7, Paragraph [0024]). Tabata does not expressly disclose a self-washing step of rotating the elastic polishing member in a position spaced from a position which said washing step is conducted in, and supplying the same liquid used in the washing step to the elastic polishing member and in this condition, deforming the elastic polishing member so as to thereby wash it, wherein after the washing step, the self-washing is conducted within the time for conveying the lens mold, such that the washing and self-washing are performed alternately.

26. Maekawa discloses a self-washing step of rotating a cleaning member comprising a layer of sponge (i.e. elastic polishing member) wound around a cleaning roller, in a position spaced from a position in which said washing step is conducted, supplying a liquid to the cleaning member and in this condition deforming the cleaning member in order to wash the cleaning member (Col. 8, lines 5-10, 37-59; Col. 9, lines 1-13). Maekawa teaches that the liquid used in the self-washing step may be water (Col. 7, lines 28-32), which is the same liquid used in the washing step. Maekawa teaches that the self-washing step is performed after the washing step is conducted, meaning that they are conducted alternately (Col. 8, lines 37-59). While Maekawa does not expressly teach that the self-washing is conducted within the time for conveying the lens mold, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to modify processing time through routine experimentation to optimize lens mold washing (MPEP 2144.05 II).

27. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method taught by Tabata to include a self-washing step as taught by Maekawa for the benefit of removing contamination that comes to adhere to the surface of a cleaning body during a cleaning process, thereby increasing the cleaning effect and prolonging the service life of the cleaning body (Col. 2, lines 29-35; Col. 9, lines 6-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to perform the self-washing step in a spaced apart position to prevent the lens mold from being recontaminated by the self-washing step.

28. As to claims 2, Tabata further discloses that the liquid may be a slurry containing an abrasive dispersed in water (Page 9, Paragraph [0035]). While the combination of Tabata and Maekawa does not expressly disclose using this liquid for the self-washing step, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a slurry containing an abrasive dispersed in water for the cleaning liquid in the self-cleaning step for the benefit of enhancing the self-washing process.

29. As to claim 3, Tabata further discloses that the liquid may be water (Page 9, Paragraph [0035]). Maekawa also teaches that the liquid used in the self-washing step may be water (Col. 7, lines 28-32),

Response to Arguments

30. Applicant's arguments filed 2/02/10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

31. Regarding the rejection of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2001-353650 to Tabata et al. (See machine translation) in view of JP S64-23224 to Murakami et al., Applicant argues that Murakami fails to cure the deficiencies of Tabata, since Murakami fails to disclose or suggest a self-washing step in a position spaced from a position which a washing step is conducted in, and does not teach that after the washing step, a self-washing step is conducted within the time for conveying the lens mold. Examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1, Murakami discloses a self-washing step where the liquid used in the self-washing step may be water (Page 5), which is the same liquid used in the washing step. Murakami teaches that the self-cleaning step is performed at a place distant from a surface to be cleaned (Page 4), so it is reasonably expected that the self-washing step is performed in a position spaced from the position where the washing step is conducted. While Murakami does not expressly teach that the self-washing is conducted within the time for conveying the lens mold, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to modify processing time through routine experimentation to optimize lens mold washing (MPEP 2144.05 II). Moreover, this newly added limitation is indefinite, as it is unclear what is meant by "the time for conveying the lens mold."

Conclusion

32. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NAOMI BIRBACH whose telephone number is (571)270-7367. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00am-5:30pm.

33. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Kornakov can be reached on 571-272-1303. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

34. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/N. B./
Naomi Birbach
Examiner, Art Unit 1792
/Michael Kornakov/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1792